

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the “skirt” claimed in claims 8, 12 and 16 is not shown. The applicant has complied by canceling these claims. However, the applicant reserves the right to reinstitute these claims with drawings showing a “skirt” in a divisional application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 18-20 as being anticipated by Manabat (U.S. 5,975,384) and has also cited the U.S. Patent Application Publication to Carmichael (US 2002/0108976), and the Gatling ‘877 and Tawil ‘064 patents as disclosing hangers having three clamping members. **It is noted that neither the Tawil ‘064 patent nor the Carmichael application include clamping members.**

The applicant has amended all of the independent claims to more specifically point out the invention and distinguish over all of the prior art. It is noted that none of the patents cited by the Examiner as having three clamping members discloses a hanger consisting essentially of a hook, a substantially straight crossbar having substantially straight parallel top and bottom surfaces and middle neck portion receiving said hook, exactly three clamps, wherein each clamp includes a first member integral with said crossbar and extending from said crossbar downward beyond said bottom surface, a second member which pivots relative to said first member, and a spring clip coupled to said first member and said second member. The advantages of such an arrangement are several as suggested by the specification. A first advantage is that by having a straight

crossbar with all three clamps including a member integral with the crossbar, the vertical height of the hanger is reduced relative to the prior art (compare Manabat, Duester, Gatling), and this saves space in displaying and shipping the garments. A second advantage is that by having a hanger consisting essentially of a hook, a cross bar, and clamps, the hanger is easier and less expensive to manufacture and more compact than the prior art.

It should be noted with regard to claims 13-17 that the Examiner has not pointed out where in the prior art that hangers such as described in Manabat, Gatling, or Duester et al. are shipped with garments thereon in cartons or containers. Indeed, it would appear that the hangers of Duester et al. would be unlikely to properly hold pants draped in the position shown during shipping. Likewise, the Gatling and Manabat hangers do not appear to be the types of hangers which would be utilized by clothes manufacturers to ship garments. The Examiner's statement is not supported by any fact, and does not logically follow from the cited prior art. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to properly make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 13-17.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain

outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David P. Gordon
Reg. No. 29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
Tel: (203) 323-1800
Fax: (203) 323-1803

June 1, 2006